



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,977	10/17/2001	Steve Dispensa	1574	1819

28004 7590 06/20/2006

SPRINT  
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY  
KSOPHT0101-Z2100  
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER

NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/981,977

Applicant(s)

DISPENSA ET AL.

Examiner

Asad M. Nawaz

Art Unit

2155

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: none.  
Claim(s) objected to: none.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 4-21, 24-41 and 44-60.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Philip Tran*  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argues in substance that A) Giroir does not teach or suggest placing a probe client on a customer premises B) Vogel does not mention wireless routers C) Giroir does not teach bulk file transfer test D) Giroir does not teach a testing or measuring speed E) Lipa does not teach forward error-correcting tests and F) Fijolek does not teach an out of lock indicator test.

In response to A), Giroir teaches that the client software usually runs on the customer workstation and the server is placed on the edge of the customer's data center/branch office (see col 2, line 61 to col 3, line 7). In response to B), Examiner asserts that it is infact Giroir that teaches the use of wireless routers and that Vogel was used as a secondary reference to teach a wireless network monitoring system in which an instruction is received into the probe device through a device to execute a plurality of test. Please refer to the previous office action for further explanation. In response to C), Giroir teaches the the probe client measuring the availability and response time by a process that can be used muliple times on a plurality of applications (see col 10, lines 17-65). In response to D), Giroir teaches that the probe mechanism connects to the application through each server while measuring the associated response time. Therefore, the application is downloaded to the customer from the server and the time lapsed is measured. This in its primitive definition is at least a measurement of download speed (see col 10, lines 55-65). In response to E) Lipa teaches that there must be enough data to conitinue with the application. One must have a proper latency rating, otherwise, the user must wait and correct the dificiency in the rating. Once there is sufficient rating, and a threashold for classification is met, the program can continue. The thresholds can vary and the proper threshold for the application must be met (see col 9, line 42-61) In response to F) Fijolek teaches that an RF interface uses a signal modulation mehtod (QAM) as a means of encoding digital information over various medium. In this case, QAM-64 is used in the RF interface to obtain a clean signal in accordance with IEEE standards (as opposed to other levels). Therefore, Giroir and Vogel still meet the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.